(SRI K. LAKKAPPA.)

figure for the entire district and for each taluk in the district may kindly be furnished);

(*b*) the target fixed this year (districtwar and talukwar figures may kindly be furnished);

(*c*) the total collection so far in the District;

(*d*) whether there were any resolutions and representations to reduce the target;

(*e*) whether any steps were taken to replace the target ?

A.—Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—

(*a*) and (*b*) Statement showing the particulars is appended below.

(*c*) 97,711 pallas of paddy up to 8th March 1953.

(*d*) Individual petitions have been received in a few cases.

(*e*) The levy has since been fixed according to the provisions of the Paddy Acquisition (Harvest) Order, 1952 and recoveries made according to this levy.

	Target fixed for collection of paddy					
	1947–48	1948–49	1949—50	1950—51	1951—52	1952—53
Hassan ..	8,000	8,868	8,000	8,714	4,959	6,000
Alur ..	36,000	36,000	30,000	40,585	35,881	38,000
Manjarabad ..	35,000	35,000	25,000	30,509	24,391	35,000
Belur ..	40,000	46,314	30,000	40,455	27,000	35,000
Arsikere ..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Channarayapatna ..	7,000	7,814	6,000	9,451	6,000	8,000
Hole-Narsipur ..	10,000	12,321	13,000	11,913	11,000	13,000
Arkalgud ..	10,000	14,131	14,000	15,000	10,000	15,000
Total ..	1,46,000	1,60,448	1,26,000	1,56,647	1,19,231	1,50,000

Order served on Mahomed Adam Kareem Sait of Tumkur to leave India.

Q.—289. Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether a reference was received from the Indian High Commissioner at Karachi or from the Government of India during the latter part of the calendar year 1950, inquiring about the genuineness of the No-Objection Certificate granted by the District Magistrate of Tumkur to Mahomed Adam Kareem Sait of Tumkur Town on or about 19th June 1950 in order to enable him to proceed to Sind-Hyderabad to bring back his wife;

(*b*) if so, the date on which the reference was received by the Government and the nature of the inquiry made by the Indian High Commissioner;

(*c*) whether the No-Objection Crtificate was genuine and if so, the reasons which necessitated the reference;

(*d*) whether Government have answered the reference and if so, on what date and to what effect;

(*e*) whether the Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore has addressed a letter on or about 13th March 1951 to the District Magistrate of Tumkur to issue an order requiring Mahomed Adam Kareem Sait to leave India immediately;

(*f*) if so, the reasons for which Government consider it necessary to order the removal of Mohamed Kareem Sait from the territory of Mysore ?

A.—Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—

(*a*) to (*f*) The Government regret that it is not possible to disclose the information in the public interests.

Scheme for timely restoration and maintenance of tanks.

Q.—412. Sri K. PRABHAKAR (Nelamangala—Scheduled Castes).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether they have got any scheme for the timely restoration and maintenance of tanks in the State;

(*b*) who will operate the working of the bulldozers in matters of desilting the tanks;

(*c*) whether the work of desilting the tanks by bulldozers is successful and profitable?

A.—Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The Agricultural Engineer and the Operational Staff, under the control of the Commissioner for Food Production.

(*c*) Yes. In particular cases.

DISQUALIFICATION ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN INCURRED BY SRI T. SIDDALINGAIYA.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As suggested by me on the 31st of last month, I now request Sri B. V. Narayana Reddy and after him Sri T. Siddalingaiya to briefly state what they have to say on the question of disqualification of Sri T. Siddalingaiya, raised by Sri B. V. Narayana Reddy.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY (Bagepalli—Gudibanda).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for affording me an opportunity to make a statement on the question of disqualification of Sri T. Siddalingaiya from being a member of this Honourable House.

Sir, I am sure you will appreciate the difficulty I am labouring under, in collecting the relevant information relating to the contract for the transport of copper wire from Dehoodepet near Poona to Bangalore, entrusted to the firm Shri Shankar & Company. Sri T. Siddalingaiya who was then the Minister for Electricity was responsible for this contract being given to this firm at a very high rate. As the recent events have shown, this resulted in his resignation from the Cabinet.

Sir, you have rightly pointed out in your ruling that when a question of his qualification is not free from doubt, a reference for the decision of Rajpramukh should not be shut out.

From the information, both oral and documentary, in my possession I will be able to show that Sri T. Siddalingaiya's undivided brother was a partner in Sri Shankar & Co. Sri T. Siddalingaiya, in his letter, dated 4th February 1953 to the Chief Minister, has stated as follows:—

> "..... another point for consideration is the relationship of my brother with Sri Shankar & Co., whose tender has been accepted. It is true that I said before the Party that my brother was a partner in the said firm. But subsequent enquiries showed the real state of affairs. One of the partners of Sri Shankar & Co., was a worker under my brother several years ago. His association in the said company made me feel that my brother must also have been there and led me to make the statement that I did. I regret that my over anxiety to be above board made me make that hasty statement. Now I know that there is documentary evidence to show that my brother is not a partner .....".

This is highly revealing.

It indicates Sri T. Siddalingaiya's attempt to get out of the inconvenient situation created by his own admission at the special meeting of the